

## REMARKS

In the Office Action dated 30 May, 2003, the Examiner indicated in the Office Action Summary that claims 1-36 were rejected. However, applicant notes that no rejection of claim 35 was actually made in the Office Action, and therefore understands claim 35 to be considered allowable.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) under the patents to Reed et al., Kaiga, Kuzumoto et al., Gadow et al., respectively. Applicant notes that these references are all directed to ozone generators, while claim 1 of the present application is directed to a *dielectric barrier discharge plasma cell*. No suggestion has been pointed out that the structures of the cited references are applicable to a device such as applicant's claimed invention.

Additionally, applicant has amended claim 1 as noted above to further distinguish the cited art, namely by directing the claim to a discharge plasma cell that is generally rectangular in cross-section and is configured for stacking with another substantially similar dielectric barrier discharge plasma cell. The references of record do not teach or suggest such a structure, an example embodiment of which is illustrated in Figure 4. It will be appreciated that configuring the cells and stacking them as shown provides greater cross-sectional coverage of the discharge plasma cells (by using multiple cells), and that providing a generally rectangular cross-section as shown in Figure 1 allows the stacking to be accomplished in a manner that minimizes or eliminates gaps between adjacent cells, as illustrated by Figure 4.

Accordingly, the combination of features of claim 1 as amended is not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether alone or in combination, and dependent claims 2-34 are likewise allowable over those references.

Claim 36 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) over Reed in view of Kaiga et al., and additionally was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) over Kaiga, Kuzumoto et al and Gadow et al., respectively. However, applicant notes that none of these references discloses a *system* including a *plurality of dielectric barrier discharge plasma cells*, but instead are directed

to various types of ozone generators. Additionally, claim 36 specifically indicates that multiple such discharge plasma cells are *stacked*, with the advantages discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 36 is directed to a different type of device than the cited references, with features that are neither taught nor suggested by those references.

In light of the foregoing, applicant submits that the pending claims as amended are in condition for allowance, notice whereof is requested.


\* \* \* \* \*

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be due, including extension fees, or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 08-3038 (Order No. 02708.0047.NPUS00).

Respectfully submitted,

HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE, LLP

By

  
Matthew Rainey

Reg. No. 32,291

Submitted Under 37 CFR § 1.34(a)

525 Market Street – Suite 3600  
San Francisco, California 94105-2708  
Tel.: (415) 848-4900  
Fax: (415) 848-4999